
Class No.

[illegible]

IS THIS PEACE?

BY
S. RADHAKRISHNAN



HIND KITABS LTD.
PUBLISHERS :: BOMBAY

First Published, December, 1945
Second Edition, August, 1946
Reprinted, September, 1950

COPYRIGHT

PRINTED BY U. NARASIMHA MALLYA, PROPRIETOR, THE B.B.D. POWER
PRESS, COTTONPET, BANGALORE CITY; AND PUBLISHED BY
U. S. MOHAN RAU, HIND KITABS LTD., 261-263, HORNBY ROAD, BOMBAY

IS THIS PEACE?¹

I. THE PROBLEM

‘RELIGION is politics; and politics is brotherhood’, said William Blake. We in this University do not hold the view that students should not take interest in politics. Rightly understood, politics is an essential branch of the art of promoting human welfare and happiness. By the dissemination of correct ideas of politics, we foster human community and well-being. Politics is sometimes regarded as the art of obtaining political power and governing masses of men, irrespective of the end to which they are led. This is not true politics, but demagoguery. We are said to govern people well, if we encourage them to the good life. Universities have Chairs for Politics to explain to students the laws which govern the social situation, the meaning of citizenship, democracy and the nature of freedom. War has corrupted many things. One of its unseen casualties is intellectual honesty. If we lose the capacity to think

¹ Being the substance of two lectures delivered at the inauguration of the Benares Hindu University Parliament on the 10th of September 1945 and at the Karachi Rotary Club on the 17th of October 1945.

with detachment and objectivity on political issues, national and international, our plans for India's freedom and world reconstruction will not be successful.

As the Premier of our University Parliament in his speech is dealing with domestic issues, I shall refer to some of the outstanding problems which demand from the leading citizens of the world intellectual integrity and love of human fellowship. In this world we have the knowledge and the power to create wealth and preserve life and promote human welfare on a scale that was never before possible and yet all this knowledge and power are used for death and destruction on a scale never known before. In the life-time of many of us, we have passed through two wars.

When the last War was over, we were told 'Never again'. The Allied leaders in the 1914-18 War said: 'Never again shall brute force sit on the throne of justice, nor barbaric strength wield the sceptre of right.' 'One thing the Kaiser has made certain, and that is, that no nation will ever commit that crime again.' We were promised a new world in which the errors of the past would be corrected, human wrongs righted, a world in which human freedom and national security would be not rhetorical slogans but operative realities. The

League of Nations was designed to be an instrument for the preservation of peace. But all our hopes were betrayed and another war in a more terrible form was thrust on us. In recent months we had the good news of the surrender of the Axis Powers both in the West and in the East and the triumph of those who exalted the common man and exhorted him to dare, risk and sacrifice his life for the noble cause of liberty and justice. We poured out our hearts in gladness and gratitude for those who were spared and for those who would not now have to suffer as those others had suffered whose voices were stilled for ever. We joined together in the tribute to the fallen and remembering them with sorrow, prayed that the young men might not march out in the same grim path, that the fire of their lives might not be quenched in the same deep waters. We are, however, again in doubt whether the leaders of the victorious nations will blast the hopes and prayers of the suffering world or whether they will, to use the words of Field Marshal Smuts, call 'a halt to the pilgrimage of death, this march to the suicide of our race'.

Burton in his *Anatomy of Melancholy* gave utterance to the view which is shared by us all: 'Man has many enemies such as lions, wolves,

serpents, but his worst enemy is his own species, since no fiend could torment, tyrannize and vex as one man doth another.' War has become total, mechanical, inhuman and unendurable. Any one with any refinement in his nature will revolt against this intolerable, suffocating, murderous business. It must cease, because it is an infringement of the laws of God and man. If we know the difference between right and wrong, we will not say, let us do evil that good may come, let us have wars that peace may issue. On the occasion of his receiving the Freedom of the City of London on the 12th June 1945 General Eisenhower said: 'My most cherished hope is that after Japan joins the Nazis in utter defeat, neither my country nor yours need ever again summon its sons and daughters from their peaceful pursuits to face the tragedies of battle.' President Truman, welcoming the delegates to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, appealed to them to rise above personal interests and adhere to principles which benefit all mankind. He said: 'With ever increasing brutality and destruction, modern warfare, if unchecked, would ultimately crush all civilization. We still have a chance—between the alternatives of the continuation of the international chaos or the establishment of a world

organization for the enforcement of peace.¹ A third world war, Field Marshal Smuts warned, might prove beyond the limits of what civilized society could endure and perhaps beyond the limits of continued existence of the human world. 'It is for us to prevent this monstrous physical possibility and make it a moral impossibility,' he said. Mankind has arrived at a crisis of its fate. The future of humanity as a civilized world depends on the effort we will now make to turn the military victory into a political one, give relief to a restless world and lift the curse of war from it. To be safe for peace, the world must be brought collectively under the reign of law and impartial justice. Will these historic months bring about the dawn of a new era when life will be organized on the basis of justice and freedom, or will the peace purchased at such a heavy price be used to re-establish the old order, to give a new lease of life to the old conflicts ?

¹ Similarly, General Douglas MacArthur, the Supreme Allied Commander, in a speech at the ceremony of the Japanese surrender remarked that all past attempts to prevent and settle international disputes had failed, leaving only the crucible of war. 'The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had the last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, doom will be at our door.'

Millions died in the hope of a new world, not so much by a clear knowledge of it as by a vague desire for it. And now we seem to dread the future. We were told that it would all be different after the War. Now that the War is over, it does not seem that it is going to be very different to what it was. If we ask the politicians to remember their promises, we are dismissed as dangerous idealists. Totalitarian wars can be waged only with the people and by the people. When people's assistance was sought, great schemes of revolution were proclaimed to get them to do the fighting. If after the War the people are robbed of the fruits of victory, it only means that the leaders practised on them deception on a large scale. The War was fought for the liberation of man, and yet liberators are not liberating us, but making us submit to the old, decayed, despised order. If we are not to throw away the victory, if the end of the present struggle is to make for the union of humanity in liberty, if it is to lead to a life unclouded by perpetual anxiety and free from imminent physical danger, we must act in a different spirit and save the world and make the peace invulnerable to the schemes of designing politicians. We owe it to ourselves and to the future generations to do everything in our power to make a repetition of the terrible madness of war impossible.

We are told that the Charter drawn up and signed at San Francisco on June 26 of this year will help us towards the goal of a more sanely organized world. This is to take the place of the old League of Nations which has obviously failed. The following reasons are assigned for the failure of the League :

- (1) America refused to participate, and Germany and Russia were excluded from the League of Nations at the beginning.
- (2) Unless a decision was unanimous, no action could be taken.
- (3) There was no sanction for enforcing the decisions of the League of Nations.

On these three points, the Security Organization of the United Nations is said to be more effective. Is it so ?

II. THE DEFEATED POWERS

GERMANY and Japan who are the defeated nations are not to be included among the United Nations. Is it the part of wisdom to keep such mighty nations with vast potential resources, suppressed and subdued, with thoughts of resentment and thirst for revenge? During the progress of the War, Marshal Stalin made out that he would not identify the German people with the Nazi clique. 'It would be ludicrous', he said, 'to identify Hitler's clique with the German people, with the German State. Experience of history shows that Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German State live on.'¹ We proclaimed in

¹ After two years of war, Stalin was able to declare :

'Sometimes the foreign Press publishes twaddle to the effect that the Red Army's aim is to exterminate the German people and to destroy the German State. This is of course a silly fable and stupid calumny against the Red Army. The Red Army's aim is to drive the German invaders from our country and to clear Soviet soil of the German-Fascist aggressors. It is highly probable that the War for the liberation of Soviet soil will lead to the expulsion or destruction of Hitler's clique. We should welcome such an outcome. But it would be ludicrous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people, with the German State. The experience of history shows that Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German State live on.

the Atlantic Charter that 'after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny [the signatories] will have to see established a peace which will afford to all nations [mark the words '*all* nations', small and great, victors and vanquished] the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.' The late President Roosevelt said: 'I should be false to the very foundation of my religious and political convictions if I should ever relinquish the hope—and even the faith—that in all peoples without exception there lives some instinct for truth, some attraction towards justice and some passion for peace, buried as they may be under a brutal regime.' Are we to abandon in the hour of victory principles which we proclaimed in the process of the war?

'The strength of the Red Army lies, finally, in the fact that it does not and cannot feel racial hatred for other peoples, including the German people; that it has been trained to recognize the equality of all peoples and races, and to respect the rights of other peoples. The Germans' racial theory and practice of racial hatred have led all freedom-loving peoples to become enemies of Fascist Germany. The U. S. S. R.'s theory of racial equality and its practice of respecting the rights of other peoples have led all freedom-loving peoples to become friends of the Soviet Union.'

The Germans and the Japanese are also human beings. They are not physiologically or congenitally more criminal than others. Like other nations, they have their ambitions and vanities. Their behaviour under the leadership which launched the War was deplorable, but so was the leadership of the victorious powers after the last War, which was used to encourage the rise and growth of dictatorships in the world. The bogey of Bolshevism led the ruling classes of Western Europe who laid the greatest stress on power, wealth and advantage, to acquiesce in the growth of Fascism and Nazism.

The Genoa Conference in 1922 and the Locarno agreement indicate the attitude of the Western Powers to Russia. Mr Ormesby Gore, a responsible British Minister, said: 'The solidarity of Christian civilization is necessary to stem the most sinister growth that has arisen in European History Locarno means that so far as the present government of Germany is concerned, it is detached from Russia and is throwing in its lot with the Western Party.' The regimes of force and fraud, of terror and hate, could not have maintained themselves, if they had not met with the silent or expressed sympathy of the governments of the democratic countries.

It will be wrong to explain, justify, or white-wash the premeditated and inhuman crimes of the Nazi regime in this War and previous to it. There can be no justification for acts like the deliberate, calculated and cynically executed massacre of the innocent population of Lidice. But are we free from all guilt? What did the democracies which were in possession of absolute power in 1918 do, in the period between the two wars, to satisfy the human need for justice? Britain and France had the power to organize the political relations of the European nations in a generous manner so as to make the European world a tolerably peaceful comity of nations. If in 1939 the victors of the first World War had to declare war on Germany, they cannot escape responsibility for the tragedy of Europe during the intervening twenty years. In their anxiety to punish and disable Germany, the victors, after the last War, flung her into an abyss of economic despair from which emerged the demon of Nazism. 'Are you surprised', asked Lloyd George, 'that after waiting for 14 years the Germans have got angry? We ought to have noticed in the swelling number of the Nazis that the young men of the nation were resenting it. We drove them to frenzy by injustice and then we make that an excuse for not redressing the

wrong.’¹ When Germany was defeated and powerless, we had neither generosity nor goodwill for her; as she began to become arrogant and powerful we sought to appease her.

In January 1933 Hitler became the Chancellor of the Third Reich. He rearmed Germany, first secretly and then openly. He influenced the plebiscite which resulted in an overwhelming majority for the return of Saar to Germany. In March 1935 he denounced the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty and introduced conscription. A year later he marched into the demilitarized Rhineland zone. In July 1938 he threw himself on the side of Franco in Spain, and Britain adopted the policy of ‘non-intervention’. Slowly Hitler grew in strength and confidence. The annexation of Austria brought back to Greater Germany provinces which even Bismarck had not the courage to touch. In the summer of 1938 the campaign started for the liberation of Sudetenland from Czecho-Slovakia, a sovereign State bound by ties of treaty and friendship to Great Britain, France and Soviet Russia. This was followed by the seizure of Memel and the *de facto* annexation of the still free Czech territories. People grew furious and the occupation of Prague led to the War. Till then

¹ In the House of Commons, March 23, 1933.

Hitler was led to believe that his policy and programme were not likely to arouse the hostility of Great Britain and France.

In 1927, when Mr Churchill was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he spoke with enthusiasm of Mussolini's 'gentle and simple bearing' and of his 'detached poise in spite of so many dangers'. 'If I had been an Italian,' Mr Churchill said, 'I am sure that I should have been with you whole-heartedly from start to finish in your triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism.'¹

'The Italian genius', wrote Lord Lloyd, 'has developed in the characteristic Fascist institutions a highly authoritarian regime which, however, threatens neither religious nor economic freedom, nor the security of other European nations The Italian system is founded on two rocks, first, the separation of Church and State and the supremacy of the Church in matters not only of faith but of morals; second, the rights of labour.'² If men of intelligence and ability like Mr Winston Churchill and Lord Lloyd felt enthusiastic about the leader of Fascism and his principles, why should we blame the poor Italians? They

¹ Speech on January 20, 1927.

² *The British Case* by Lord Lloyd, with a Preface by Viscount Halifax (1939).

are simple people who believe what their leaders tell them, especially when they tell them the same thing day after day. If Churchill's party lost the recent election, it is a symbolic protest against the type of mind which stood for the appeasement of Nazi Germany and opposition to Soviet Russia.

As for Japan, she was the ally of Britain and France in the last War. When Japan invaded Manchuria, no single Government felt that it was an attempt against the reign of law among nations. Why should we suffer and die 'for an unknown part of the world', to use the words of the American Foreign Secretary Mr Stimson, or what have we to do with 'the affairs of a foreign country of which we know little', as Neville Chamberlain said of Czecho-Slovakia? It is significant that Mr L. S. Amery, the late Secretary of State for India, said in the House of Commons on 27-2-1933, after the Japanese attack on Manchuria: 'I confess that I see no reason whatever why, either in act or in word, or in sympathy, we should go individually or intentionally against Japan in this matter. Japan has got a very powerful case based on fundamental realities. Who is there among us to cast the first stone and to say that Japan ought not to have acted with the object of creating peace and order in Manchuria

and defending herself against the continual aggression of vigorous Chinese nationalism? Our whole policy in India, our whole policy in Egypt, stand condemned if we condemn Japan.' Japan acquired Manchuria and Korea, attacked China and occupied a part of it, and would have continued to be the great friend of Great Britain, if a war had not broken out in Europe and Japan had not joined Germany.

The ruling classes of Western democracies were not in any way unfriendly to the imperialist aggressions of Germany, Italy and Japan. They put the dictators in the saddle, secured them in it, flattered them, and yielded to them, till at last the peoples asserted their rights and forced them to resist. Almost all nations were dominated by an attitude of aloofness and indifference when about a dozen countries passed through agony. Belgium, Holland, Norway, Yugoslavia, Poland, and France and England, Russia and the United States of America, were looking on as detached spectators up to the moment of the German attack on Poland. No country seems to have been free from the malady of the age, from the sickness of the times—selfish nationalism. The indisputable guilt of the Axis Powers should not blind us to the fact that few countries are

sinless enough to cast the first stone with a clear conscience. If we tolerate wrong-doing for long, we become responsible for it.

Are Germany and Japan more criminal than the Allied Nations? It is true that the Axis Powers did things which were outlawed by the international code. There were loud complaints against Germany when she launched the flying bomb which was condemned as 'an instrument of blind malice', 'an aimless destroyer', because there is no pretence that it is aimed at military objects only. The violation of that code by the flying bomb, however, becomes insignificant when we take the colossal violation of it by the atomic bomb.¹ It is true that in this War no poison gas was used. It was not a moral scruple or a sense of honour that prevented its employment. There was the fear of reprisal—if any one nation used it, the others would also use it. That is why we read today that the 'American-built London ship *Empire*

¹ The Japanese News Agency announced that the atom bomb claimed 2,44,000 out of the 2,50,000 population of Hiroshima. Nagasaki suffered equally terrible losses. Another Japanese account says: 'All living things, human and animal, in Hiroshima were literally seared to death by the atomic bomb. The dead and injured were burned beyond recognition and the authorities are unable to check civilian casualties. The city is a disastrous ruin.'

Simba of 5691 tons will leave a little Scottish harbour in a few days to sail out into the Atlantic where she will be scuttled with 8000 tons of poison gas Britain held in readiness, had the Germans used gas first.' But in the atomic bomb, there was no fear of retaliation, as the Axis Powers had no equivalent for it. The obvious difference between war and massacre is just here. A war is fought while a massacre is merely suffered. We do not make war on people who do not fight and retaliate. We can only murder them. Killing unarmed civilians by raining death on them from the clouds is condemned as a contemptible crime. It is not war. President Wilson felt obliged to take the United States into the war of 1914-18, because the Germans threatened to use the submarines in a way that would endanger civilian life. Would he have allowed the Americans to use the atomic bomb? The use of the atom bomb is justified on the ground that it shortened the duration of the War. After the fall of Germany, the defeat of Japan was certain. It was only a question of time. Was it right, in such circumstances, to have used the atom bomb?¹ After the first atom bomb was dropped

¹ The British Commander, Lt.-General Percival, who was a prisoner of the Japanese for three and a half years, said: 'I don't think the atom bomb shortened the war

on Hiroshima, President Truman argued that Japan's treacherous attack on Pearl Harbour and her cruel treatment of war prisoners justified the use of the bomb. So he allowed a second bomb to be dropped and threatened to go on until Japan and her people either surrendered or were destroyed. Countries at war with one another easily persuade themselves that their enemies are the worst fiends and deserve the most cruel treatment. But will the civilized opinion of the world admit the validity of this plea? Hugo Grotius wrote of his times: 'I saw prevailing throughout the Christian world a license in making war of which even barbarous nations would have been ashamed; recourse being had to arms for slight reasons or no reasons; and when arms were once taken up, all reverence for divine or human law was thrown away, just as if men

to any considerable extent.' Speaking at a celebration in his honour in Washington, Admiral Chester Nimitz, Commander of the United States Pacific Fleet, said: 'The atomic bomb did not win the war against Japan. The Japanese had, in fact, already sued for peace before the atomic age was announced to the world with the destruction of Hiroshima and before the Russian entry into the War. In saying that the atomic bomb played no decisive part from a purely military standpoint in the defeat of Japan, I do not make an effort to minimize the awful power of this new weapon.'

were henceforth authorized to commit all crimes without restraint.' There is no conceivable extreme of man's inhumanity to man that cannot be justified on reasons of high policy. Mr Churchill, in the House of Commons, said: 'Six years' total war had convinced most people that had the Germans or the Japanese discovered the new weapon, they would have used it upon the Allies to their complete destruction with the utmost alacrity.' This may be true, but then, does it not follow that the British and the Americans are as good or as bad as the Germans and the Japanese? What happens to the claim that it is a war of Christendom against paganism or of civilization against barbarism? Can we sustain the plea that we are 'fighting for a moral and not merely a material issue?' In this 'grim ferocious epoch' vast 'horrors and miseries' were inflicted by nations who claim to be the most civilized. If the Axis Powers had used the atom bomb, they would have been condemned as the greatest war criminals. Since the victorious Allies used it, it is condoned, though it is against all laws of international usage and morality. The only justification urged for it is military necessity.

According to the decision of the War Crimes Commission, the wanton destruction of towns and civilian populations is a war crime. The

obliteration, without previous warning, of the Japanese towns, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, is a war crime, for which there is no parallel. The Allies, who are responsible for it, claim, as all war criminals do, military necessity and the saving of the lives of soldiers. Military necessity in these contexts means military convenience. Evidently the Allies seem to have accepted one of the fundamentals of the Nazi creed that expediency or military necessity is sufficient justification for using any method to obtain one's objective, however horrible and barbaric that method may be.

All this talk about war crimes is pure hypocrisy. On every side war has ceased to be fair fight and degenerated into mass-murder. We require a great deal of self-examination before we set about dispensing justice and retribution for war crimes. The only crime, which is the concentration of all crimes, is war itself, and for starting it we are all responsible. We started the War with the noble object of fighting the evil things, 'brute force, bad faith, injustice, oppression and persecution'. We ended the War by the greatest act of outrage on civilized values.

It will be difficult for us to exclude Germany and Japan from the United Nations organization on the ground of their criminality or their way of life which is irreconcilable with ours.

Again, can we say that what won the War is the power of spirit and the love of freedom? The Allied Nations are not all democracies. It is not their democracy or love of freedom that has saved them. We won the War by the power of physical force, scientific cunning, industrial organization and ruthless determination to defeat the enemy, unenfeebled by any scruples of conscience, honour, or international morality. Marshal Stalin raised his glass at Teheran, not to American idealism but to American production, to the way in which American resources and industrial genius were mobilized in the War. Technical backwardness of the enemy, not our moral superiority, is the real reason of our victory.

In these solemn moments, when we approach the problem of the future of the world, let us do so in a mood of humility and repentance, without rancour or hatred in our hearts. Let us not forget the lessons of the last War; if we do so, we may have to learn them again by the hard way. Let us deal with the defeated nations in a spirit of tolerance, sympathy and goodwill, and not in a spirit of distrust, malice or hatred.¹ We can build a better world only if

¹ A Christmas appeal to the people of America on behalf of the children of Europe was issued on 23rd December 1945 by fifty prominent Churchmen and

we have faith and understanding. The wounds of the world must not be kept open, but healed. We must adopt a policy which will make our erstwhile enemies willing partners in a world society and organization designed to prevent aggressive wars. Let us resolve to look upon them as fellow members of one society and provide for their economic and political security. In the last War we said that we were fighting for security for all, but actually we fought for security for ourselves alone. We paid the penalty for that wrong-doing in World War II. It will be wise to announce that Germany and Japan will be admitted into the fellowship of the United Nations Organization as soon as they set up governments elected by their peoples and answerable to them.

laymen. It asks the people to petition the Congress to join in the effort to save Europe's children 'regardless of race, nationality or creed'. It says that 'millions of Europe's children live in hearthless rooms, often without windows, with leaking roofs and sometimes open to the winter sky. Their food must also fuel their bodies with heat.'

III. THE POWER OF VETO

THE Security Council of the United Nations Organization consists of five permanent members, the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, China and France; and six members elected by the General Assembly serving for a period of two years, three being elected each year. No nation may serve two successive terms. All decisions of the Council should be by a majority of seven members, which must include the five permanent members except for matters of procedure, the election of the Judges of the World Court and the convening of the special Constitutional Convention for revising the Charter. It means that any one of the permanent members can veto a decision of the Council, even if all the other ten members are in favour of it. The only exception is, that if a permanent member is itself a party to the dispute, it must stand aside while the Council discusses the methods of conciliation; but if there is a suggestion for taking action, it can again exercise its veto. Any Power which is not in the Security Council, when called upon to furnish forces or facilities, will itself participate in the deliberations of the Security Council with the right to vote. Every nation of the United Nations has a seat in the Assembly. So

in the Security organization we do not have any democratically representative world authority but power is centralized in the hands of the United States, Great Britain and Russia. The lesser powers come in the orbit of one or the other of the Big Three, who will control the fate of mankind. The United States will extend its Protectorate over the North American Continent including Canada, the twenty Latin American Republics and a large part of the Pacific. America and Soviet Russia are struggling for control over China. Great Britain, apart from her Empire, will get the support of a large number of European States, including Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Greece, Turkey and the Middle East. France is finding her position difficult and does not know yet on which side to throw her weight. Russia will have, besides the Soviet Union, Finland, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Poland, a large part of Germany and Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Manchuria in the Far East. For the sake of survival and self-preservation, these small nations will carry out the orders of their respective overlords. The United Nations agreed at San Francisco to the establishment of the dictatorship of the Big Three. It is a scheme

of a mechanical balance of power on a large scale, designed to prevent wars and lay firm foundations of a future peace! .

Within the three spheres of influence, regional blocs are permitted such as the Inter-American system or the Pan-Arab League, with certain limited powers. They may settle their own disputes by peaceful means, but if they fail to do so, the Council will step in and decide for them. One hopes that these regional groups will not so develop as to challenge the supremacy of their masters, the Big Three.

The new organization does not dispense with the Nation States but gives to all the United Nations equality in the matter of their sovereignty. In a world of atomic bombs, the doctrine of unlimited national sovereignty would make for the destruction of mankind. In the new world no power can be considered to be secure either in its sovereignty or in its independence, if it is not able to maintain its own atomic bomb plants. If the powers who are anxious for their sovereign independence equip themselves with such plants, the danger of a world catastrophe would be very serious. We dare not leave the control of this weapon in national hands. The horror of it is that we have become so inured to mechanical death that we will invent more and more devilish

instruments of destruction, which, if uncontrolled, have the power of obliterating the human species from the earth. If the honour of the human race is not to be altogether destroyed, if the danger of universal desecration is to be averted, an international authority should be set up.

While it is essential to develop, as far as possible, international collaboration, we have not yet reached a stage when we can have a world-state. We do not seem to be ready for a world authority either by habit or by general inclination. The national forces are still active, and within limits they have to be recognized. The example of Russia demonstrates that the feeling for one's native country and tradition is strong and cannot, at the present stage of our cultural development, be superseded by a love of humanity. The first World War precipitated the Revolution of 1917 in Russia and it was directed by the Radical Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. Both these believed that the Russian Revolution was merely the beginning of an international revolution that would spread to all countries, free the people from capitalist oppression and establish classless societies in which the nationalist governments controlled by capitalist classes would 'wither away'. Lenin did not believe

that the Revolution could succeed in the long run in one country only, and in his time the policy of the Soviet Government was designed to promote the cause of international communism, by assisting and directing through the Third International (the Comintern) the Communist parties in other countries. In those days a good communist should have no national prejudices. To be patriotic, to love 'Mother Russia', was to be guilty of bourgeois sentimentalism. To be a good communist was to renounce one's allegiance to the nation, to regard oneself a member of an international brotherhood and be loyal to the supreme cause of the international proletarian revolution. Lenin died in 1924 and soon Stalin expelled Trotsky from the party and gained control of the government. Gradually the policy of promoting international communism was abandoned. The Russian people were not much interested in promoting a world-wide communist revolution. The love of Mother Russia could not be destroyed by official decrees or intellectual indoctrination. International communism was gradually subordinated by Stalin to national interests. Trotsky's followers bitterly resented all this and complained that Stalin had betrayed the Revolution. It was not betrayed by him but defeated by circumstances.

The invasion of Russia by the German Army led Stalin to make alliance with all anti-communist bourgeois governments that were fighting Hitler. As a concession to them, the Comintern was abolished.

The Soviet view of the dissolution of the Communist International was explained by Stalin in a letter quoted below:

(a) 'It exposes the lie of the Hitlerites to the effect that "Moscow" allegedly intends to intervene in the life of other nations and to "Bolshevizize" them. An end is now put to this lie.

(b) 'It exposes the calumny of the adversaries of communism within the labour movement to the effect that communist parties in various countries are allegedly acting not in the interest of their people but on orders from outside. An end is now being put to this calumny too.

(c) 'It facilitates the work of patriots of all countries for uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries, regardless of party or religious faith, into a single camp of national liberation—for unfolding the struggle against fascism.

(d) 'It facilitates the work of patriots of all countries for uniting all freedom-loving peoples into a single international camp for the fight against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism, thus clearing the way to the future

organization of a *companionship of nations based upon their equality*.'¹

Thus one great obstacle to the free and frank collaboration of Soviet Russia and the Anglo-American democracies was removed. While the Charter recognizes the reality of nation states, it attempts to limit in certain essential respects their sovereign rights. We must be patriots without ceasing to be men. Nation states should regard themselves as parts of a world whole.

While the World Charter admits the equality in sovereignty of all member states, such a vast country like India is not yet a sovereign state. Her delegates at the San Francisco Conference were nominees of the Indian Government and not of the Indian people, and this happened in spite of India's effective contribution to the War which is acknowledged on all hands.² Particular attention to this was drawn by the Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia.

¹ Letter to Reuter's Chief Moscow Correspondent, May 28, 1943.

² The Secretary of State for India sent the following message to the Viceroy on the cessation of hostilities in Europe (8-5-1945):

'After five and a half years' bitter conflict, complete victory over our enemies in Europe has been achieved. At this great moment in history, I send to the Princes and peoples of India, the profound and grateful thanks of His Majesty's Government for all that India has done in

The years of revolution for the world have been years of stagnation for India. The sufferings and hardships of the Indian people for which the British Government cannot escape responsibility call for a radical change in the government of the country. According to the Woodhead Report on the Bengal famine, the number of deaths is placed somewhere between fifteen and twenty lakhs, a figure higher than the losses of the whole British Commonwealth

this long struggle. The valour and deeds of the Indian Army have been beyond all praise. Names, such as Sidi Barrani, Keren, Amba Alagi, El Alamein, and Cassino will live as long as epics of bravery are told among men.

'The Royal Indian Navy has taken its part in this victory. Nor must we ever forget the work of the Indian merchant seamen who, through great dangers, have toiled to maintain the traffic of the sea. Although the Royal Indian Air Force has had no part in the European war, many an Indian has served with distinction in the R.A.F. The Royal Indian Air Force can point with pride to the laurels it has been winning in Burma.

'Behind her armed forces, India has stood as a base giving support both in the East and the West. This base was created with the help of the Princes and labour and industry of the people of India. Theirs indeed has been an amazing effort. Unflagging maintenance of that effort will hasten the defeat of Japan.

'Already, in the brilliant campaign in which so many of India's sons are serving, the Japanese have been driven from Rangoon.'

in the War over the total period of 6 years, which is estimated to be about eleven lakhs. In spite of absolute British rule in India for over 150 years, the peasants are poor and uneducated, the crops are thin and the industries undeveloped. The problems of national reconstruction, the offensive against poverty and disease, illiteracy and unemployment as well as against inertia, prejudice and obscurantism can be tackled only by a national government.

Representation on the Security Council is based on power. We seem to be still subject to the rule of might. All the time, the appeal, directly or indirectly, is to the argument of force. It is not easy to define what a great power is. National character, social structure are indefinable factors. The mathematical elements are more easy to calculate than the metaphysical ones. Judged by both tests, territorial extent, strategical situation, capacity to feed its population from its own resources, agricultural and industrial, fertility of the soil and abundance of mineral resources as well as the cultural heritage and the values of mind and spirit, India deserves to be counted a great nation. Her important role in strengthening the foundations of world peace cannot be overlooked.

Unanimity is demanded, not from the Assembly as in the League, but from the Big Five.

If these five do not agree on any matter, no action can be taken. Each of them has a veto on any measures proposed to be adopted against itself as an aggressor. It is the great nations that are open to the temptation to use their power without due regard to the rights of states less powerful than themselves. History gives us many illustrations of how the great states used their power to take what they wanted because they wanted it and had the power to take it with impunity. No great state is guiltless in this matter. Yet collective action cannot be taken against the great Powers because each of them has the right to veto any proposed action. What was possible under the League Covenant, the sending of the Lytton mission to China or the Assembly decision on Italy's aggression in Ethiopia, would not be possible under the new Charter. A realistic view is adopted that, if any great Power insists on aggressive action, a world war will result. Apparently there is no provision for dealing with such a possibility. As the five great Powers must agree before any action is taken, conflicts among them lie outside the jurisdiction of the world organization. We do not seem to be opposed to aggression as such, but only to aggression by the small Powers. The Charter may prevent or deal with minor acts of aggression

which otherwise might have large consequences. Even in the world of small Powers, the sudden veto of one of the five permanent members may operate to prevent quick and effective common action. Besides, action taken to prevent even a renewal of Axis aggression under bilateral treaties negotiated for the purpose can be pursued without any reference to the United Nations Organization.

The World Court of Justice will not be very effective as its decisions will be subject, directly or indirectly, to the veto power of the Security Council. Disputes can be submitted to the Court only if the parties agree, but the Security Council is not bound to act on the decision of the Court.

The Security Council will be in permanent session, and representatives serving on it will have the opportunity to consider, as they arise, situations and disputes likely to endanger the peace of the world. History indicates that violent aggression does not break out without previous warning in the form of international tensions and disputes which accumulate friction and hatred until the use of force seems to be the only way out. If these disputes are settled by the Security Council, it may well prove a useful organization. To further the pacific settlement of disputes, the Security Council may

call upon parties to a dispute to seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, or resort to regional agencies. Members as well as non-members of the Organization may bring such situations to the notice of the Council. The Council may recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment at any stage of a dispute, and if the parties fail to settle it by peaceful methods, the Council may recommend not only a method of settlement but even the terms of settlement. There is a provision but the Security Organization may be called upon to enforce a decision of the Council if either party to a dispute refuses to accept the Council's ruling.

The formidable provisions made for mobilizing world forces for the service of the United Nations Organization seem a little out of proportion to the small range of problems which the Security Council is authorized to handle. Unless we are ready to take up the cause of every threatened nation, whether it is great or small, unless we regard every aggression as a threat to the reign of international law and not merely to that nation, the peace mission of the Charter will not succeed.

.

IV. CONFLICTS AMONG THE GREAT POWERS

WE HAVE to convert the hegemony of the big Powers into a world concert. The three big Powers, Soviet Russia, United States and Great Britain, have to practise self-restraint in the interests of world peace. When Soviet Russia declared war against Japan, it was felt that the union of the big three would be more effective than before and they would continue to co-operate in peace as closely as they did in war, that they would develop a unity of purpose, if not an identity of outlook. But unfortunately the rivalries are already coming out. When the feeling of danger that brought the great Powers together disappeared, the Powers began to separate themselves. Some of the British scientists were refused permission to attend the celebrations of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The secret of the atomic bomb is not to be revealed to Russia. It is true that President Truman recommends that, while the secret of the atomic bomb will be retained by Britain and the United States, there will be full assurance given to the United Nations Organization and its members that it will be used only in keeping the peace as determined by the Organization's Security Council. To save humanity from itself, the two Powers,

United States and Great Britain would retain in their hands the secret of the atom bomb. The whole conception is fantastic. Every advanced country will have before long weapons as good or as bad as the atom bomb and if their use is to be prevented, the whole drift towards madness should be stopped. It is futile to attempt to maintain the secret of the atomic bomb as an Anglo-American monopoly. More powerful engines of destruction will be devised in years to come by other members of the Security Council who are advanced in matters of scientific research. We hear reports that America is preparing a bigger sized atomic bomb, a hundred times more powerful than the ones that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which may kill people thousands of miles away from the scene of explosion. On the seventh of November 1945, Mr Churchill defended in the House of Commons President Truman's policy of not sharing the secret of the atom bomb with Russia. He said: 'During the War we imparted many secrets to the Russians, but we were not conscious of any adequate reciprocity. I therefore hope that Britain, Canada and the United States will adhere to President Truman's policy and treat their knowledge as a sacred trust to be guarded for the benefit of all nation.' M. Molotov, speaking

at the October Revolution anniversary celebrations in Moscow on the sixth of November, said: 'We too shall have atomic energy and many other things,'—perhaps of greater destructiveness.

There is a pregnant saying of Jesus that is very relevant to the present problem—'There is nothing covered up that shall not be revealed, and hid, that shall not be known.' Unless the members of the Security Council share their secrets fully and freely and are willing to carry out the wishes of the Council in their respective territories, the world-organization itself will be subject to the disease of pre-natal decay.

Again, in the Russian zone of occupation in Germany 'a German Government' has been set up without any intimation to the British, American and French members of the Allied Control Commission. In the Russian zone, renewal of German trade unions is permitted, while it is forbidden in the British, the American and even the French areas. In the East, endeavours to re-institute orthodox political parties, conservative, liberal and socialist, are encouraged, while they are discouraged in the West.

France's ideas about the settlement with Germany are quite different. On the eve of

the meeting of the foreign ministers in London, General de Gaulle said to the Paris correspondent of the London *Times* very clearly :

‘That Britain should have consented to the settlement of the German problem without France was not only galling for France, but an absurdity with regard to Europe.

‘The military and political security of France, Belgium, Holland and Britain demanded that the Rhineland be placed under their joint strategic and political control. It should be once and for all cut off from the body of the German State in such a way that its inhabitants should know that their future did not lie with Germany.

‘Ruhr coal was of vital importance to the other European countries, and while Germany must have her share of it, she must not be a distributor of it. If nations whose welfare depended on Ruhr coal and industry imposed an international regime on that territory, they would have a common stake, the existence of which would lead the whole Continent of Europe to co-operation.

‘The Rhine was another factor whose internationalization would make for the unity as Western Europe.

‘The Rhineland would retain its cultural independence. The rest of Germany would

certainly not be as powerful or as rich as before. But if the Ruhr remained international, Germany would never again be a danger, because control of the Ruhr meant control of German Industry.¹

Soviet Russia is anxious to build for herself a protective chain of buffer states. Two wars have demonstrated her real need for easy and direct access to the sea. Russian proposals to Turkey include not only the return to Russia of the territories ceded by Russia before the last war, but also control over the Dardanelles. She is also seeking to gain a corridor across Persia from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf. While sharing in all major Conferences at Potsdam or at San Francisco, Russia is effecting settlements of her own. Following the defeat of Finland, she fixed her boundaries where she wanted them. With British and American support she fixed the eastern frontiers of Poland at the Curzon line, and without their support pushed back the western boundaries to the Oder. Ruthenia, the extreme eastern end of Czecho-Slovakia, was ceded to the Ukranian Republic on the ground that the overwhelming majority of the population of Ruthenia is Ukranian. The Czechs did not

¹ 10th September 1945.

like it, as they wished to retain their pre-war boundaries intact.

Russia has concluded a treaty with Hungary by which she obtains a fifty per cent participation in Hungarian industry, and an agreement with Austria which assures her a royalty interest in Austria's oil supplies. In spite of the Sino-Soviet treaty, Outer Mongolia and Inner Mongolia are unified, it is believed, with the support of Russia and the Chinese Communist Eighth Army. If Russia feels afraid and insecure, the pre-War attitude of western democracies and the refusal of America to share with her the secret of the atom bomb are to some extent responsible. Relations with Soviet Russia which were not conspicuous for friendliness before the War have not improved since the attainment of victory. It is difficult to say whether Russia's actions are inspired by a spirit of aggression or fear of it.

There are problems of Trieste, Yugoslavia, and the Balkan States which will try the patience and goodwill of the big Powers. The world Charter does not guarantee the territorial integrity of nations such as that contained in Article 10 of the League Covenant. Though the guns are silent for the present, the earth is shaking with the rivalries of strategic and social systems which have not found an equilibrium.

V. COLONIAL RIVALRIES

THE Charter insists on the acceptance of collective responsibility for the discharge of certain moral obligations towards countries which, for one reason or another, stand in need of protection. The trusteeship proposal take the place of Article 22 of the old League Covenant relating to the mandatory system. They attempt to give effect to the principle that the welfare and development of peoples who cannot stand by themselves form a sacred trust of civilization. The trusteeship system applies to the territories now under mandate and to those which are to be detached from the enemy states, as the result of the victory of the Allied Nations. Each trust territory is to be allotted an 'Administering Authority'. This may be one or more States or the United Nations as a whole. The 'terms of trusteeship' are to be framed for each trust territory and submitted for final approval to the General Assembly or, in the case of 'strategic areas', to the Security Council. Except with regard to the 'strategic areas' supreme authority in all matters connected with the 'trusteeship system' is vested in the General Assembly.

The difficulties of the application of the system in the interests of the peoples themselves

are numerous but not formidable, if we have goodwill. Whether the system is to be applied to all the territories mandated, as well as those possessions surrendered by Japan and Italy, is left uncertain. Which of them are to become 'trust territories' is a 'matter for subsequent agreement'. The mandated territories are to be brought under the system. At the Conference itself there was discussion about what is known as the Conservatory clause which provides for the continuation of the existing mandates received from the old League of Nations. Russia protested against this clause and ultimately acquiesced in it with the addition of a provision that 'nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of negotiation and conclusion of agreement for placing mandated and other territories under the trusteeship system'. The resolution is a compromise between the present owners of Empire, who did not wish to set the dependent territories on the path of independence, and Soviet Russia which demanded complete independence for all foreign dominated territories. The compromise, however, does not seem to make any difference to the position of the Colonies, and their possessors are struggling to continue their hold on them.

The terms of trusteeship are to be agreed upon by 'the States directly concerned'. How are we to define what these 'States' are? The only guidance we get is that in the case of mandated territories the 'States directly concerned' will include the mandatory power. The word 'directly' is capable of different interpretations. By whom and through what process is the 'Administering Authority' to be nominated?

As the Security Council is responsible for preserving the peace, certain of the territories taken from Italy and Japan, which are of strategic importance, will be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Security Council. As the permanent members of the Security Council have to bear the brunt of responsibility in assuring the future peace of the world, they should co-operate closely in the disposition of strategic bases throughout the world, for these are as important for the United Nations as ships and planes. It will be difficult, however, to decide whether a particular area is of strategic importance or not. The Empire-minded will attempt to prove that they need, in the interests of world peace, military bases, special rights and industrial and economic monopolies. In a world of atomic bombs, strategic areas and military bases have not

much meaning. Besides, strategic factors should not supersede human considerations. President Truman, in his broadcast to his people on his return from Potsdam, made it clear that America will 'maintain the bases necessary for the complete protection of our interests and of world peace.' She will acquire any other bases 'which our military experts deem to be essential for our protection'. He argued for the international control of the European waterways including the Turkish Straits. He made it clear that the strategical interests of America extended to the Mediterranean. By insisting on the control of the islands occupied by the United States in the Pacific and refusing to accept the proposal of independence for colonial peoples, America is adopting a policy of military imperialism. Her excuse is that Britain is determined to maintain her Empire at any cost and Russia is not putting her trust in a world-organization but is fortifying her position by a system of military alliances and puppet governments. To gain the consent of the Western Powers for her demand for Pacific bases, America is supporting the colonial policies of the Western Powers. She is also anxious to keep Russia out of South America. On the occasion of the raising of the official U. S. Victory flag over the head-

quarters of the U. S. Group Control Council in Berlin, President Truman said: 'Let us not forget that we are fighting for peace and for the welfare of mankind. We are not fighting for conquest. There is not one piece of territory or one thing of a monetary nature that we want out of this War. We want peace, and prosperity for the world as a whole.' Yet this declaration was qualified in different ways. Some said that his statement referred only to Europe. New Mexico's Senator, Carl Hatch, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, observed: 'I think the President was speaking of not retaining territory for selfish gain. Any Pacific area we keep will be for defence purposes only and is likely to be almost entirely worthless for any other purpose.' At a recent Press Conference, the President said: 'Outside of the right to establish the necessary bases for our own protection, we look for nothing which belongs to any other Power. We seek to use our military strength solely to preserve the peace of the world, for we know that it is the only sure way to make our own freedom secure.'

The security zones of Great Britain and Russia overlap in Iran. Great Britain owns airfields in southern Iran and Russia wishes to have her share. Iran may be partitioned because the ambitious powers can be satisfied

only by it. The United Nations Organization is being used to air national animosities.

In the clauses relating to the trusteeship system, there are many points which are left vague, perhaps intentionally. There are a good many loose ends, and in interpreting the clauses, the old rivalries are manifesting themselves. In the House of Commons, Mr Attlee, in reply to a question by Mr Churchill on August 23, 1945, said that he fully recollected the British Government's statements that Britain did not contemplate any modification in the sovereignty of His Majesty's territories in the Far East and would bear them in mind. Mr Churchill said: 'While expressing gratification at the answer of the Prime Minister, may I presume that he recalls that, on numerous occasions and particularly at the Cairo Conference in 1943, the British Government have made it plain that they do not contemplate any modification in the sovereignty of His Majesty's territories in the Far East?' Mr Attlee said in reply: 'Yes, I have very full recollection of those statements and will bear them in mind.' Apparently the Labour Government intends to carry on the Imperial traditions of its predecessors.

Italy, after her surrender, declared war against Japan and offered to take an active

part in the Far East war. This was intended to secure for her the status of an Ally. What is to be the future of Italy's African possessions? Will Tripoli come under the trusteeship scheme? Will Cyrenaica be set up as an Arab State? Are Eritrea and Italian Somaliland to be attached to British Sudan or Ethiopia, or partitioned between the two, the ports to be held by Britain on a trusteeship basis and the rest to be attached to Ethiopia? While Britain contends that the whole of the Mediterranean area should be regarded as an exclusive British sphere of influence, America rejects this contention and presses for the international control of these territories. If Russia is shut out of the Mediterranean sphere, she will not be happy. She is staking a claim in the Mediterranean and in the Red Sea.

What is to be the future status of the Dutch Far Eastern Empire which had been maintained in pre-war years largely owing to the support of the British power in the East? The Committee of Indonesians in Australia, speaking on behalf of over seven crore people of Indonesia, declares: 'The reimposition of the undemocratic and ruthless Dutch rule over the peoples of Indonesia is not, and never will be, acceptable to our peoples.' The Dutch Premier, Dr Gerbrandy, at a Press Conference on

June 9, 1945 in London prior to his departure for Holland, propounded an original geographical conception, according to which Dutch colonial territories were to be permanently regarded as a physical continuation of Metropolitan Holland. When pressed to define Dutch Government's attitude regarding the application of the trusteeship principle to Dutch East Indies, the Dutch Premier stressed that the question did not arise as these territories were part of the Netherlands. Carrying the principle of Imperial overlordship to its logical conclusion, he said: 'You can no more think of applying the principle of trusteeship to the Dutch East Indies than applying it to Holland itself.' When Queen Wilhelmina proclaimed a plan to put Java on an equal status with the Netherlands, she did not get into details about the process. But her Prime Minister was quite definite. Though Japan was defeated in the War, she succeeded in her aim to endow the peoples of the East with a passion for independence. The situation in Java is confused and there are loud complaints that the Imperial Powers are helping the Dutch to continue their control over the Dutch East Indies.

France, which suffered in the early days of the War and was liberated after the Allied

invasion, France which knows what loss of liberty, oppression and massacre of the innocents mean, wishes to continue her 'civilizing' mission in Syria and the Lebanon, in Africa and in Indo-China, the task which was begun there 60 years ago. On the 3rd June 1945 at a Press Conference in Paris, General de Gaulle recalled the eminent part played for centuries by France in the East, 'because of her intellectual, moral and spiritual influence and also of her close affinity with the Arab world'. He recognizes that 'England also had in those Eastern countries a very important role which she wanted to play, but generally speaking for other reasons, because of her naval and commercial interests.' He distinguishes between the cultural emphasis of France and the material emphasis of Britain. When both France and England found themselves side by side in the East, difficulties arose. He says: 'The British have often repeated, and perhaps believed, that they wanted to leave France free to steer her own course in Syria and the Lebanon, in the way she considers best. England has said and perhaps believed that. Unfortunately it is only too true that she has not always done so.' General de Gaulle continues: 'On the other hand, France proclaimed the independence of Syria and the Lebanon, which

was the aim of her mandate and declared that she was ready to negotiate with Syria and Lebanon the practical conditions under which they would exercise their independence.' He felt that the complications in the smooth establishment of the new independence arose 'because of the attitude adopted either from above by the British Government, or from below by a crowd of British Agents who assumed a hostile or at least a critical attitude towards us.' On the 30th May 1945, Mr Churchill asked de Gaulle to order the French troops to the barracks, as otherwise the British and the French troops on the spot were likely to clash. After the conclusion of the War with Germany, the two Allied nations were about to get into strife. At the end of the Conference, General de Gaulle used words which were somewhat bellicose. In the present situation, he declared that 'all the French people are completely determined and united behind their government to see that their interests and dignity are respected and resolved, if necessary, to make them be respected.' France is willing to grant independence to Syria and the Lebanon, if there is security that the petrol allotted to her from Mosul will be safely carried through the pipeline to the sea, if her strategic interests are protected, if her ships are

allowed to call at certain ports. If the British can retain the military air-fields in Iraq, they should be able to understand France's concern for her schools, her pipeline from Mosul and her strategical requirements. If the theory of absolute independence for the Arab state is sound, and that is the theory developed by Great Britain in her demands on France in the Levant, a very sound democratic principle, it is just as sound for Trans-Jordania, Iraq, Egypt and Palestine, as it is for Syria and the Lebanon. And yet at San Francisco, Lord Cranborne explained that there is a legal impediment preventing transfer of the Palestine or any other mandate of the old League of Nations to the proposed trusteeship Council of the new organization for world security. If the mandates are a trust, legally instituted by the League of Nations, there is no point in bringing pressure on the French mandates in Lebanon and Syria. 'France is prepared to modify her rule to suit the new conditions and will put into force the new Statute of the Union of Indo-China as laid down by the Declaration of March 1943, which, among other provisions, stipulates the election of a Federal Assembly.¹ The

¹ The French High Commissioner in Indo-China, Admiral Thierry d'Argenlieu, gave a message to the

people of Indo-China, however, proclaim that they would rather die than continue in subjection. The anti-French activities of the Annamites are brought under control by the British and Indian forces,² though it is stressed by the British 'that the job of the British forces is to try to maintain law and order and that we are in no way interested in the internal politics of the country.' The suspicion is wide-spread that the British are waiting for the

people: People of Indo-China, believe in the promise of the Government of the Republic. France wants to help you, she wants to put at your disposal auxiliary advisers and technicians, and not to re-establish direct administration. She does not want to govern your respective nations. She wants for you the emancipation and autonomy of free and adult nations. She offers you this within the French Union, not to enslave or tyrannize over you—forgive me to have to use this out-of-date jargon—but in order that every member of this Union may benefit from each of the other members, in order that each nation of the Indo-Chinese Union may see its horizon broaden, its potential increased, its characteristic genius, its customs respected, and its security better established in a world where, believe me, little nations run the risk of being crushed.'

² India had an honoured place in the whole East, and if she is today treated as an unwelcome intruder, it is to no small extent due to the fact that Indian troops are being employed for establishing imperial domination and suppressing freedom movements. While it is open to the

arrival of the French forces in sufficient strength to suppress the resistance of the Annamites.

Egypt is being persuaded not to press for the revision of the Treaty and the withdrawal of British troops from the Suez Canal. The Persian Government is demanding withdrawal of both the Russian and the British occupational forces from her soil, in accordance with the pledge given at Teheran. Her sovereignty is only nominal, if she cannot move her troops to any province without the consent of a foreign Power. Whereas the countries liberated from the grip of Axis Powers, like Manchuria and Korea, are allowed to shape their destinies in accordance with the desires of the people determined by democratic processes, the dependencies of the Allied nations are to be restored to their pre-war empires—Java to the Dutch, Indo-China to the French, Hongkong to the British. Imperial Powers do not like to get off the backs of the dependent peoples. Was the War fought to liberate only those who were suffering from the domination of the Axis Powers or was it fought to free all those who were suffering from political bondage, whether it is imposed by the Axis Powers or the Allied

Australian seamen and airmen to refuse to co-operate with the Dutch in Indonesia, the Indians are compelled to help the Dutch to retain their hold on Indonesia.

Nations? There is a suspicion that the victorious powers wish to have what they hold and, if anything, add to their general strength. They may carry on negotiations until they have had time to recuperate and show their hand. Nations which have the expansive instinct cannot be trusted to be the nurses and guardians of a better world.

In dealing with colonial problems, the Big Powers must adopt a more constructive attitude, if the revolutionary implications of the War and the profound changes produced by it in the colonial peoples are to be recognized. The march for freedom of the peoples of Indo-China, Dutch East Indies, Korea, can be checked only by superior armed forces. So long as these millions of people are prevented from obtaining their independence on which they are determined, there is no chance of an enduring peace. It is time for organized international action to take a constructive line.

Racial pride is not the creation of the Nazis. There are territories under the control of the Allied Nations where the coloured people are treated as commodities much less valuable than cattle. President Roosevelt said: 'Racial strife renders us suspect abroad.' 'Men of all races, black, white, brown and yellow, fight beside us for freedom. We cannot stand

before the world as champions of the oppressed peoples unless we practise as well as preach the principles of democracy for all men.' Race prejudice and racially justified injustices reveal the contrast between the promise and the performance of the Allied Nations. Academic refutations of racial superstitions cause only more strain. In this War the part which the coloured people played in the achievement of victory is substantial. China suffered most and longest in the war against Japan and helped considerably in the attainment of victory. Britain could not have defended herself in Europe or Africa or Asia without the help of India. Soviet Russia owed a great deal to her Asiatic citizens. The myth of the incompetence of the Asiatic to control the machine and manage the machine age has disappeared. The great religions have been preaching racial brotherhood for centuries, but we are yet far away from the goal. We do not remove evil by announcing ideals. Of the three great Powers, Soviet Russia has sympathy for the aspirations of the coloured peoples.¹ No

¹ As early as November 1941, Stalin declared: 'We have not, nor can we have, such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples, irrespective of whether European peoples or territories, or Asiatic peoples or territories, including Iran, are

person should, by reason of his race or colour, be deprived of the essential things due to him or her as a human being. We must set up an entirely new regime in order to abolish the major evils and enmities that spring from colonial rivalries. Great Britain should withdraw her military and political power from India, Burma, Ceylon, North Borneo, the Straits Settlements, the Federated Malay States, Singapore and Hongkong; France should withdraw from Indo-China; Russia from all Asiatic possessions inhabited chiefly by non-Russians, and the United States from the Philippines and Hawaii. If any of them or the African colonies require assistance, the International Trusteeship Council should see to it that they get the required aid and are helped to take their path towards national independence as soon as possible. President Truman stresses the right of all people to self-Government in the fourth of his twelve commandments. 'We believe that all peoples who are prepared for concerned We have not, nor can we have, such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their own lives on their own land as they see fit, with absolute freedom.'

self government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice without any interference from any foreign source. This is true in Europe, in Asia and in Africa as well as in the Western Hemisphere.' We should not, however, think that when a thing has been said it has also been done. If we wish to avoid colonial rivalries and consequent clashes among the Big Powers, the United Nations Organization as a whole, and not any single Power, should become the trustee of countries which are not yet in a position to be independent.

Apparently the Great Powers are not inclined to make a new start but are drifting into the old methods and pre-war rivalries. The delaying policy of Britain in India, Burma, Ceylon and Malaya, the unrest in Indo-China and Dutch East Indies, the tension in the Middle East, especially in Palestine, the seething in the Balkans, the spectres of famine and disease in Germany and Japan, the unsolved problems of Greece and Italy, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia, require wisdom and courageous statesmanship which seem to be lacking among those in power. President Truman's plea for conscription in America and the *Red Star's* advice to the Russian soldier 'to keep his weapons in first-class condition' are ominous

symptoms of increasing fear, jealousy and suspicion. The lack of confidence seems to be making for a new armaments race.¹ What is it that prevents us from taking the straight road to mutual help and understanding? Confused, struggling, aspiring humanity seems to be like a drunkard who cannot give up drink, like an addict who cannot give up his drug, though he wants to do so. We seem to be caught in a net from which we are struggling to escape but seem unable to do so and save ourselves. The peoples of the world must force their Governments to change their old ways of life and frame the peace treaty, not for preserving the old privileges and interests of the Big Powers but for ensuring the liberty and happiness of the common people of all lands. The aim of public policy should be a better life for the common man and not the maintenance of national sovereignties. If the Big Powers do not trust one another, they will let things drift until a catastrophe overtakes them. Is it right to let the world spin on to its destruction? If the world is to be saved from atomic wars, we have to work for a world-government.

¹ Secretary of State Brynes states that it is 'imperative' that the draft act be extended.

VI. INTERNATIONAL FORCE

JUSTICE in the international sphere is futile if there is no force to back it. The World Charter is superior to the League Covenant in its emphasis on machinery for assuring economic and military collaboration. But the plan relating to the organization of an International Force to be employed by the Big Five against aggressor States is not free from difficulties. The world will continue to have nations for a long time to come, who will be deterred from crimes and aggression only when they know that they cannot commit them with impunity. This requires an international police force consisting of all three services, recruited, organized and equipped by an international authority. It means that the member states will have to surrender a part of their sovereignty and allow the international authority to carry out in their territories the tasks necessary for raising, training and organizing the international force. We must give to the international force a monopoly of certain types of material so as to give it superiority of armament. The control of atomic armaments should be vested in the World Security organization and national armaments of this type should be

outlawed. When science has taken a leap forward, statesmanship should not lag behind. Research and development of powerful explosives should be under the control of the international authority, which must be of the nature of a world state possessing jurisdiction and administrative powers in certain matters in all countries. President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee tell us that they will adopt measures to control the use of the atom bomb by an international authority which will use it only against aggressive countries in the future. Politically it would be much easier to provide men and material for an international force than to agree to allot part of the national forces to the world organization. The former course will not create political difficulties. It is not the nations that declare war but the international authority. At the critical moment, the nations might hesitate to supply the forces they are called upon to do. An international force composed of men owning allegiance to particular nations may prove weak in times of crises. To expect the unco-ordinated armies, navies and air-forces of the different nations to go to the rescue of the world organization, when a crisis arises, may be a sign of over-optimism. We require a force which is truly international in spirit and purpose to be at

the call of the world authority. This means that the nations should be prepared to surrender a part of their sovereignty in their search for world peace. The international organization should, in some respects, become a world government. National sovereignty must be restricted to domestic and economic affairs and subordinated in international relations to the reign of law and impartial justice. A Federal Government should be set up, which will be in charge of problems of peace and war, while the member States will have exclusive control of the social structure. This will secure that the different national governments follow their own ways of life and yet are subordinate to a central government in matters of their security and defence.

•

VII. CULTURAL CO-OPERATION

TREATIES, settlements, alliances, do not secure permanent peace, for they deal with the existing causes of conflict but do not affect the underlying conditions which make conflicts possible. It is no use cutting down the weeds, if we leave their roots in the soil which will produce the noxious growth when there is a favourable opportunity. It will not do, if we merely establish the machinery which will deal with disputes as they arise; we have to examine and change, where necessary, the ideals and institutions which we are accustomed to regard as the foundations of society, the ideas and institutions which periodically produce catastrophes. We must endeavour to establish a new social harmony in which conflicts will not arise. It will not do to denounce war and acquiesce in the mechanism of contemporary society, in the competitive way of life, which is inherently doomed to war. War is only a symptom; it is not the disease. We cannot shake off the symptom if we do not cure the entire nature of our body politic. The national and the class divisions, the racial and the religious cleavages, are not based on anything inherent in human nature. There is no biological validity or scientific sanction which will

make such conflicts unavoidable. If anything, these are deviations from the broad path of social evolution, injurious to the human race and destructive of human happiness.¹

If the ideals proclaimed by the Allied Nations during the progress of the War are to be implemented in these critical years, we must work for the fullest development of human personality and the defence of human liberty against encroachments by the State, for the inalienable right of all nations to freedom and equality and the repudiation of imperialism, whether of the victors or of the vanquished, and the adoption of clean weapons and the rejection of violence and falsehood as instruments of either domestic or international policy. We must devise new refined methods of adjusting rivalries and reaching an under-

¹ Erasmus wrote: 'Nature or rather God hath shaped this creature (that is, man) not to war but to friendship, not to destruction but to health, not to wrong but to kindness and benevolence. For whereas Nature has armed all other beasts with their own armour . . . man alone she hath brought forth naked, weak, tender and without armour, with most soft flesh and smooth skin.' In the *Utopia* Sir Thomas More writes: 'The fellowship of nature is a stronge league; and that men be better and more surely knitte together by love and benevolence, than by Leagues and Covenantes; by hartie affections of mind than by woordes.'

standing. Unless the Peace Conference believes in the acceptance of these ideals for the whole world, there can be no just and lasting peace. This War was fought for the establishment of a better life for nations and individuals, for the realization of a world union in which aggression is rendered impossible. In a spirit of humility and repentance, in the consciousness that all nations and governments wronged their weaker victims when they had the power and got the chance, we should work for a world in which national freedom will be safe and individuals will have the right to think and act according to the light in them. Those who represent their nations at the Peace table must speak not only for their countries but for humanity as a whole.¹ We require statesmen

¹The breakdown of the Foreign Ministers' Conference is due to the fact that each of them is manœuvring for power for his country and is indifferent to the interests of mankind as a whole. To cite an example, while Britain and the United States look upon the Governments of Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria as insufficiently democratic, Soviet Russia which established these governments regards them as democratic and representative. Each country is caring for its own security and is not interested in organizing peace under a world authority. The walk-out staged by Russia at the meeting of the Security Council on 25th of March 1946 indicates that the Big Powers are not prepared to submit to the rule of law and are willing

who will take a moral view of politics and not politicians who, with their fixed habits of orthodox diplomacy, let us drift into the disasters of this War. The only certain means of salvation from the terrible evil of war and the chaos of the world is the perception that we cannot correct evil while we are ourselves evil. We cannot reform others until we are remade from within. Great things are accomplished by human worth rather than by legal documents.

While demanding freedom for nations, let us not surrender the conscience of humanity.² Gandhi is insistent that India should not sacrifice her inner wealth of spirit in her anxiety to to use the United Nations Organization for furthering their own separatist interests.

² 'Your first duty,' wrote Mazzini, 'first as regards importance, is towards humanity. 'You are men before you are citizens and fathers. If you do not embrace the whole human family in your affections, if you do not bear witness to the unity of that family, if . . . you are not ready, if able, to aid the unhappy . . . you violate your law of life and you comprehend not that religion which will be the guide and blessing of the future.'—*The Duties of Man*, Ch. XII.

Even Fichte tried to achieve a synthesis between national and universal interest. 'The patriot wishes the purpose of mankind to be reached first of all in that nation of which he is a member . . . This purpose is the only possible patriotic goal . . . Cosmopolitanism is the will that the purpose of life and of man be attained in all

achieve her rightful place in the comity of nations. Her striving for freedom should accord with her inner enlightenment.

Politics is a branch of Ethics. That is Aristotle. That is Gandhi. The immensely powerful forces of human stupidity, inertia, greed, jealousy and malice are to be overcome. There is no defence against atomic power in war, except in the regeneration of mankind. If the peoples of the future would live together and work for the common good, we must establish and reverence a basic law, which, notwithstanding national diversities, must be valid for all and recognized by all, a law of human rights, guaranteeing every individual his security, his inviolability, his right to work and to the enjoyment of life. The governments of the world must be based on the belief that man as man and in his essential quality as man has worth and value and political organizations are there to serve and protect this human worth and value, irrespective of race, colour, or religion. We must believe in man, not out of pity or pride, but because it is truth and religion.

mankind. Patriotism is the will that this purpose be attained first of all in that nation of which we are members.'—Quoted in R. Niebuhr: *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness* (1945), p. 32.

No international machinery can automatically solve problems which arise among the powers owing to their conflicts of interest. We must overcome the disparity between our phenomenal scientific advance and our infantile political sense. There is nothing in the organization of the Charter that will do that. This has to be accomplished by other means, by the development of understanding and co-operation. In the new world organization there is a part allotted to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. To it is assigned the task of reinforcing peace in the spiritual and intellectual sphere and the means proposed is international co-operation in education and the furtherance of cultural inter-change in the Arts, the Humanities, and the Sciences'. Economic considerations are important, but they have not been the sole or even the main causes of difference between nations. An essential condition of peace is understanding, the sharing of knowledge and ideals. The colossal increase of knowledge simultaneously with the stunting of wisdom has landed us in this new Dark Age. We have to rethink human life in terms of spiritual value and re-educate the nations so as to raise the world on to new foundations. We must cultivate the science of human relationships and learn to live together

and work together.¹ Unfortunately our systems of education are devised for national purposes, for the development of national loyalty and the upholding of established social institutions. They blast the charities of the human heart and strip the spirit of its ardour. It is no use planning for the future while defending the past. In the new scheme of education which we frame for the new world, the State should look upon war as a national danger to be guarded against, as much as flood, fire or famine. It should not encourage the emotion of patriotism. It should devote its activities solely to the material welfare of the community, the preservation of order and the prevention and punishment of crime. No attempt should be made to make all men think alike. Knowledge and science have made for greater fulness of life in all directions. Ignorance and superstition are man's greatest foes. Humanity is the goal and nations are convenient administrative units, and their subordinate character should never be overlooked. The raw material

¹ The late Mr H. A. L. Fisher said of the last War, (1914-1918) that 'it was fought between the most highly civilized peoples in Europe on an issue which a few level-headed men would easily have composed, and with respect to which ninety-nine per cent of the populations were wholly indifferent.'

of 'one world' is present; it must become an organized psychological unity. Science and politics, trade and transport, have produced a state in which different peoples are drawn together into a unity. No nation can hereafter isolate itself. Let us give to this world, which has found itself as one body, a world soul. Let us make the mechanical unity into a spiritual concord. Asoka, in the third century B.C., concludes his famous Rock Edict 12, dealing with the toleration of creeds, with the memorable words—*samavāya eva sādhuḥ*, concord alone is the supreme good. In human development the process of civilization has resulted in the formation of a number of separate sovereign states, limited in scope by the factors of geographical remoteness, lack of communications, racial distinctiveness and cultural development. All these show today signs of a rapid breakdown. The fragmentation of human society into sixty sovereign states in a world which is getting more and more integrated by mechanization is the root cause of wars. Science has made nations depend on one another for their means of living; other disciplines should create the conditions for controlling their integral life. We should see all men and nations as one brotherhood. We should develop a world culture and a world conscience.

If we are to speed up this process and achieve in greater measure the point of view of world citizens, as seems essential in the future, we should cultivate a universal, comprehensive mental outlook. It is our duty to educate the politicians as well as the common people to a high level of international civic intelligence.

Universalism has been innate in the Indian character. But it has assumed a high, pure and noble form and so has won for us the sympathy and admiration of the world. It never took the shape of an ambition for world domination. It has expressed itself as world sympathy, understanding, open-mindedness and so has contributed to the enrichment of the world. India with her distinctive spiritual outlook can provide the world with the soul for which it is seeking.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Indian Philosophy, Vol. I
(Fourth Edition)

Indian Philosophy, Vol. II
(Fourth Edition)

The Hindu View of Life
(Seventh Impression)

An Idealist View of Life
(Third Impression)

East and West in Religion
(Second Impression)

Bhagavadgita
(*George Allen and Unwin*)

**Eastern Religions and Western
Thought** (Second Edition)
(*Clarendon Press*)

**Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflec-
tions on his Life and Work**
(Third Edition)
(*George Allen and Unwin;*
Kitabistan, Allahabad)

The Heart of Hindusthan

Freedom and Culture

India and China
(Second Impression)

Kalki or the Future of Civilization
(Second Impression)

Gautama The Buddha
(Third Impression)

Great Indians
(*Hind Kitabs*)

**PRESIDENT'S
SECRETARIAT**

LIBRARY

